A U M

The man who does not go through his appointed work in life—has lived in vain.
—*The Voice of the Silence*

THEOSOPHY

Vol. L **October, 1962** **No. 12**

WHAT IS THEOSOPHY?

A useful discussion of this question occurs in the pages of the *Canadian Theosophist* for July-August of this year. It opens with the remark by D. W. Barr, general secretary of the T.S. in Canada: "I do not remember any other article in our magazine, or any other Theosophical magazine, which has aroused as much attention as Dr. W. E. Wilks' 'Is Theosophy a Definite Philosophy?' " Mr. Barr speaks of several examinations of the question, including editorials by Mr. Sri Ram in the *Theosophist* and by Dr. Henry Smith in the *American Theosophist.* (Sri Ram's contribution to the "Watch-Tower" Department is reprinted in the *Canadian Theosophist.*)

In his introduction, Mr. Barr says:

> Certainly The Secret Doctrine does contain specific teachings on certain aspects of Theosophy—the unity of all life, the divinity of man, reincarnation, karma and so on. At present, it is agreed that such teachings, even though they are accepted by the majority of members, should not be adopted as a fixed code. But what of the future? If the time ever comes when *The Secret Doctrine,* and it alone, is regarded as our Holy Book, our Bible of Theosophy, and a set of ideas drawn therefrom is gradually adopted as a Theosophical belief, the Society will be well on its way toward sectarianism.

The essential view of Mr. Sri Ram is put in the following words:

> Truth is the order and nature of things that exist and take place. Theosophy, though literally a Wisdom, has to be identified with this Truth. Therefore Theosophy is something that exists in its own right; it is not what may be imagined by anyone, which imagination is generally according to one's background and conditioning. The Mahatmas, and H.P.B. under Their inspiration and guidance, have stated the truth about the universe and man, to the extent that those aspects of that truth which are capable of being expressed in words or as a concrete

> pattern could be put before the public. But neither the *Mahatma Letters,* which They themselves thought were confusing as they stood, nor H.P.B.'s writings nor any other writings would help us to the essential truth and vastness of it if they are set up as a Bible. Nor should the words Theosophy and Truth be limited to them or to any other books that exist, for Truth is infinite. . . .

In this framework of evaluation, two reasons are given for avoiding the expression, "a definite philosophy," as describing Theosophy. First is the admitted fact that the recorded works of H. P. Blavatsky and her Teachers by no means present the *whole* of the Wisdom Religion. Second, were the teachings in these works allowed to become some kind of "holy writ," the Theosophical Movement would be overtaken by dogmatism and the sectarian spirit.

Actually, it is easy to find in H.P.B. confirmation of the view that all written or even spoken expressions of Theosophic verity are at best approximations or suggestive intimations of the inner truth which is immeasurable and lies behind. As she wrote in "What is Truth?":

> In every age there have been Sages who had mastered the absolute and yet could teach but relative truths. For none yet, born of mortal woman in *our* race, has, or could have given out, the whole and the final truth to another man, for every one of us has to find that (to him) final knowledge *in* himself. As no two minds can be absolutely alike, each has to receive the supreme illumination *through* itself, according to its capacity, and from no *human* light. The greatest adept living can reveal of the Universal Truth only so much as the mind he is impressing it upon can assimilate. . . .

This, surely, is the foundation on which all considerations of the "definiteness" of the Theosophical teachings or philosophy should rest. It goes without saying that a communicated body of ideas—which must have some definiteness, or it cannot be called a body of ideas—is an expression of relative, not absolute truth. As H.P.B. says:

> Is there such a thing as *absolute truth* in the hands of any one party or man? Reason answers, "there cannot be." There is no room for absolute truth upon any subject whatsoever, in a world as finite and conditioned as man is himself. But there are relative truths, and we have to make the best we can of them.

So the question resolves itself into another sort of problem: Where do we find the best statement of the "relative truths" which are appropriate for the understanding of the human beings of our time?

Manifestly, H.P.B. was not one to claim an exclusive right to atten-

tion as teacher of Theosophy. She said in behalf of her *Lucifer*:

> . . . the editors are studiously careful not to offer the reader only those truths which they find reflected in their own personal brains. They offer the public a wide choice, and refuse to show bigotry and intolerance, which are the chief landmarks on the path of Sectarianism.

Then, in another *Lucifer* (October, 1889) article, "Philosophers and Philosophicules," she examined the question of "definite philosophy" directly, in answer to critics:

> In the published "Constitution and Rules" great stress is laid upon the absolutely non-sectarian character of the Society. It is constantly insisted upon that it has no creed, no philosophy, no religion, no dogmas, and even no special views of its own to advocate, still less to impose on its members. And yet—
>
> "Why, bless us! is it not as undeniable a fact that certain very definite views of a philosophic and, strictly speaking, of a religious character are held by the Founders and most prominent members of the Society?"
>
> "Verily so," we answer. "But where is the alleged contradiction in this? Neither the Founders, nor the 'most prominent members,' nor yet the majority thereof, constitute *the* Society, but only a certain portion of it, which moreover, having no creed as a body, yet allows its members to believe as and what they please." In answer to this, we are told:—
>
> "Very true; yet these doctrines are collectively called 'Theosophy.' What is your explanation of this?"
>
> We reply:—"To call them so is a 'collective' mistake; one of those loose applications of terms to things that ought to be more carefully defined: and the neglect of members to do so is now bearing its fruits. In fact it is an oversight as harmful as that which followed the confusion of the two terms 'buddhism' and 'bodhism,' leading the Wisdom philosophy to be mistaken for the religion of Buddha."
>
> But it is still urged that when these doctrines are examined it becomes very clear that all the work which the Society as a body has done in the East and the West depended upon them. This is obviously true in the case of the doctrine of the underlying unity of all religions and the existence, as claimed by Theosophists, of a common source called the Wisdom-religion of the secret teaching, from which, according to the same claims, all existing forms of religion are directly or indirectly derived. Admitting this, we are pressed to explain how can the T.S. as a body be said to have no special views or doctrines to inculcate, no creed and no dogmas, when these are "the back-bone of the Society, its very heart and soul"?
>
> To this we can only answer that it is still another error. That these teachings are most undeniably the "back-bone" of the Theosophical

> Societies *in the West,* but not at all in the East, where such Branch Societies number almost five to one in the West. Were these special doctrines the "heart and soul" of the whole body, then Theosophy and its T.S. would have died out in India and Ceylon since 1885— and this is surely not the case. For, not only have they been virtually abandoned at Adyar since that year, as there was no one to teach them, but while some Brahmin Theosophists were very much opposed to that teaching being made public, others—the more orthodox—positively opposed them as being inimical to their exoteric systems.

It is plain enough from the foregoing that the Theosophical Society, as a formal body, has no "definite teachings," and in the scheme of things according to its Constitution and Rules can have none. But it is equally plain, if we read between the lines, that H.P.B. offered "definite" teachings, and while one may say that her teachings can be no more than "relative truth," those who attend what she has written soon become convinced that H.P.B. has the natural authority of a teacher who understands what needs to be taught and how to teach it.

Ought the Theosophical Society to "endorse" H.P.B. as the sole "prophet" of Theosophy? It can hardly do so. But Theosophists can do H.P.B. the honor of recognizing that without her, there would be no Theosophical Movement, no focus for investigating the truths which it exists to pursue; and they have at least a strong obligation to study her writings with some seriousness, since the very matrix in which they have their being as students is owed to the basic ideas she introduced to the modern world. No one, it might be added, had a better right to *define* Theosophy than H.P.B., and she undertook such definition in dozens of places in her works.

Finally, when H.P.B. says that the "special views or doctrines" which she put of record "are most undeniably the 'backbone' of the Theosophical Societies in the West," she is saying in other words what she said elsewhere in *Lucifer*—that she regarded her readers as *disciples* in quest of the underlying truth of the Wisdom-Religion. Theosophy, then, is a "definite philosophy" for those who accept H.P.B. as their teacher. It may be something quite different for those who do not.

A sentence in the July-August *Canadian Theosophist,* occurring in a panel discussion of this general subject makes a fitting conclusion:

> It would not be fair for a student to make an assessment of the value of the teachings of H.P.B., unless he has made his study directly from her works.

LITERARY JOTTINGS

ON CRITICISM, AUTHORITIES, AND OTHER MATTERS

By an Unpopular Philosopher

THEOSOPHISTS and editors of Theosophical periodicals are constantly warned, by the prudent and the faint-hearted, to beware of giving offence to "authorities," whether scientific or social. Public Opinion, they urge, is the most dangerous of all foes, Criticism of it is fatal, we are told. Criticism can hardly hope to make the person or subject so discussed amend or become amended. Yet it gives offence to the many, and makes Theosophists hateful. "Judge not, if thou wilt not be judged," is the habitual warning.

It is precisely because Theosophists would themselves be judged and court impartial criticism, that they begin by rendering that service to their fellow-men. Mutual criticism is a most healthy policy, and helps to establish final and definite rules in life—practical, not merely theoretical. We have had enough of theories. The *Bible* is full of wholesome advice, yet few are the Christians who have ever applied any of its ethical injunctions to their daily lives. If one criticism is hurtful so is another; so also is every innovation, or even the presentation of some old thing under a new aspect, as both have necessarily to clash with the views of this or another "authority." I maintain, on the contrary, that criticism is the great benefactor of thought in general; and still more so of those men who never think for themselves but rely in everything upon acknowledged "authorities" and social routine.

For what is an "authority" upon any question, after all? No more, really, than a light streaming upon a certain object through one single, more or less wide, chink, and illuminating it, *from one side only*. Such light, besides being the faithful reflector of the *personal views* of but one man—very often merely that of his special hobby—can never help in the examination of a question or a subject from all its aspects and sides. Thus, the authority appealed to will often prove but of little help, yet the profane, who attempts to present the given question or object under another aspect and in a different light, is forthwith hooted for his great audacity. Does he not attempt to upset solid "authorities," and fly in the face of respectable and time-honored routine thought?

Note.—This article by H. P. Blavatsky appeared posthumously, in *Lucifer*, September, 1892, and was last reprinted in Theosophy for May, 1951.

Friends and foes! Criticism is the sole salvation from intellectual stagnation. It is the beneficent goad which stimulates to life and action —hence to healthy changes—the heavy ruminants called Routine and Prejudice, in private as in social life. Adverse opinions are like conflicting winds which brush from the quiet surface of a lake the green scum that tends to settle upon still waters. If every clear stream of independent thought, which runs through the field of life outside the old grooves traced by Public Opinion, had to be arrested and to come to a standstill, the results would prove very sad. The streams would no longer feed the common pond called Society, and its waters would become still more stagnant than they are. Result: it is the most orthodox "authorities" of the social pond who would be the first to get sucked down still deeper into its ooze and slime.

Things, even as they now stand, present no very bright outlook as regards progress and social reforms. In this last quarter of the century it is women alone who have achieved any visible beneficent progress. Men, in their ferocious egotism and sex-privilege, have fought hard, but have been defeated on almost every line. Thus, the younger generations of women look hopeful enough. They will hardly swell the future ranks of stiff-necked and cruel Mrs. Grundy. Those who today lead her no longer invincible battalions on the warpath, are the older Amazons of respectable society, and her young men, the male "flowers of evil," the nocturnal plants that blossom in the hothouses known as clubs. The Brummels of our modern day have become worse gossips than the old dowagers ever were in the dawn of our century.

To oppose or criticize such foes, or even to find the least fault with them, is to commit the one unpardonable social sin. An Unpopular Philosopher, however, has little to fear, and notes his thoughts, indifferent to the loudest "war-cry" from those quarters. He examines his enemies of both sexes with the calm and placid eye of one who has nothing to lose, and counts the ugly blotches and wrinkles on the "sacred" face of Mrs. Grundy, as he would count the deadly poisonous flowers on the branches of a majestic *mancenillier*—through a telescope from afar. He will never approach the tree, or rest under its lethal shade.

"Thou shalt not set thyself against the Lord's anointed," saith David. But since the "authorities," social and scientific, are always the first to break that law, others may occasionally follow the good example.

Besides, the "anointed" ones are not always those of the Lord; many of them being more of the "self-anointed" sort.

Thus, whenever taken to task for disrespect to Science and its "authorities," which the Unpopular Philosopher is accused of rejecting, he demurs to the statement. To reject the *infallibility* of a man of Science is not quite the same as to repudiate his learning. A *specialist* is one, precisely because he has some one specialty, and is therefore less reliable in other branches of Science, and even in the general appreciation of his own subject. Official school Science is based upon temporary foundations, so far. It will advance upon straight lines so long only as it is not compelled to deviate from its old grooves, in consequence of fresh and unexpected discoveries in the fathomless mines of knowledge.

Science is like a railway train which carries its baggage van from one terminus to the other, and with which no one except the railway officials may interfere. But passengers who travel by the same train can hardly be prevented from quitting the direct line at fixed stations, to proceed, if they so like, by diverging roads. They should have this option, without being taxed with libelling the chief line. To proceed *beyond* the terminus on horseback, cart or foot, or even to undertake pioneer work, by cutting entirely new paths through the great virgin forests and thickets of public ignorance, is their undoubted prerogative. Other explorers are sure to follow; nor less sure are they to criticize the newly-cut pathway. They will thus do more good than harm. For truth, according to an old Belgian proverb, is always the result of conflicting opinions, like the spark that flies out from the shock of two flints struck together.

Why should men of learning be always so inclined to regard Science as their own personal property? Is knowledge a kind of indivisible family estate, entailed only on the elder sons of Science? Truth belongs to all, or ought so to belong; excepting always those few special branches of knowledge which should be preserved ever secret, like those two-edged weapons that both kill and save. Some philosopher compared knowledge to a ladder, the top of which was more easily reached by a man unencumbered by heavy luggage, than by him who has to drag along an enormous bale of old conventionalities, faded out and dried. Moreover, such a one must look back every moment, for fear of losing some of his fossils. Is it owing to such extra weight that so few of them ever reach the summit of the ladder, and that they affirm there is *nothing* beyond the highest rung *they* have reached? Or is it for the sake of pre-

serving the old dried-up plants of the Past that they deny the very possibility of any fresh, living blossoms, on new forms of life, in the Future?

Whatever their answer, without such optimistic hope in the ever-becoming, life would be little worth living. What between "authorities," their fear of, and wrath at the slightest criticism—each and all of them demanding to be regarded as infallible in their respective departments—the world threatens to fossilize in its old prejudices and routine. Fogeyism grins its skeleton-like sneer at every innovation or new form of thought. In the great battle of life for the survival of the fittest, each of these forms becomes in turn the master, and then the tyrant, forcing back all new growth as its own was checked. But the true Philosopher, however "unpopular," seeks to grasp the actual life, which, springing fresh from the inner source of Being, the rock of truth, is ever moving onward. He feels equal contempt for all the little puddles that stagnate lazily on the flat and marshy fields of social life.

SUBTLETIES OF TRANSMISSION

Theosophy is not in conflict with any form of religion, any society, any man, any opinion—however much these may be in conflict with Theosophy. Theosophy serves to explain the hidden side, the real and inner meaning of all things, for it is a friend to understanding, an aid to knowledge. By it a man may come to know himself through and through. It is because of misunderstanding of the real Self that we have all these religions, sects, parties, dogmas, with all their vested interests and sustainers. Although all that we can say is but a re-statement, there is a different light cast sometimes by a word or an application, which will be helpful and useful to some. Most minds cannot look beyond the person, with his faults and limitations, beyond the giver to the gift itself and all that it implies, and so, expect too much of the personality in that it does not fully embody what is handed on.

—ROBERT CROSBIE

UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD A FACT IN NATURE

I HAVE been requested to speak on the subject of Universal Brotherhood as a fact in nature, not as a theory, not as a Utopian dream which can never be realized; not as a fact in society, not as a fact in government, but as a fact in nature. That is, Universal Brotherhood is an actual thing, whether it is recognized or whether it is not. Christian priests have claimed for some years, without right, that Christianity introduced the idea of universal Brotherhood. The reason the claim was made, I suppose, was because those who made it did not know that other religions at other times had the same doctrine. It is found in the Buddhist scriptures, it is found in the Chinese books, it is found in the Parsee books, it is found everywhere in the history of the world, long before the first year of the Christian Era began. So it is not a special idea from the Christian scriptures. Every nation, then, every civilization has brought forward this doctrine, and the facts of history show us that, more than at any other time, the last eighteen hundred years have seen this doctrine violated in society, in government, and in nations. So that at last men have come to say, "Universal Brotherhood is very beautiful; it is something that we all desire, but it is impossible to realize." With one word they declare the noble doctrine, and with the other they deny the possibility of its ever being realized.

Why is this the case? Why is it that although Christianity and other religions have brought forward this doctrine, it has been violated? We cannot deny that it has been. The history of even the last few years proves it. The history of the last forty years in America, without going any further back, proves that this doctrine has been violated in the West. How could it have been a doctrine that the Americans believed in when they had slavery in their midst? How could it have been believed in by the French when they stretched out their hand and demanded of Siam, a weak and powerless nation, that it must give up to them its own property? How could it have been believed in by the Germans and French when they constructed engines of war and went into battle and

---

NOTE.—This address by Mr. Judge was presented at the Theosophical Congress in the Parliament of Religions, held at the Chicago World's Fair, September, 1893, and is reprinted for the second time in this magazine from the Report of Proceedings issued by the American Section of the Theosophical Society. The article was last reprinted in THEOSOPHY for December, 1947.

destroyed each other by the thousand? Does not the American War of the Rebellion and the vast amount of treasure wasted and the thousands slain in that civil war prove conclusively that Universal Brotherhood had not been practiced? It has been professed but not practiced.

Go further back, go back in the history of the nations of Europe, without going to any other country, and what do you find? Do you not find sectarian prejudice? Their view of Universal Brotherhood has for years prevented the progress of science. Is it not true that only since science became materialized—a most remarkable thing, but it is true—I insist that since then, only, science has made progress. If Universal Brotherhood had been a belief of this nation, then we would not have had the burning of witches in America; nor in other countries would we have had the burning of Catholics by Protestants, nor the burning of Protestants by Catholics; we would not have had the persecutions that have stained the pages of history; and yet we have always claimed that we have had Universal Brotherhood. We have had the theory but not the practice.

Now, then, has there not been something wanting? It is a beautiful doctrine. It is the only doctrine of the Theosophical Society, the only thing that any man is asked by us to subscribe to. What then, is the matter with it? Why so many men who say that it is beautiful, but it is impossible, simply impossible? There are even some branches of the Christian church which say, "There is Jesus; why, the altruistic, noble teachings of Christ are beautiful; but no State could live three months under such doctrine." The reason that it has not prevailed in practice is that it has been denied in the heart.

The Theosophist who knows anything about life insists that Universal Brotherhood is not a mere theory. It is a fact, a living, ever-present fact, from which no nation can hope to escape; no man can escape from it, and every man who violates it violates a law, violates the greatest law of nature, which will react upon him and make him suffer. And that is why we have had suffering; that is why you have in Chicago, in London, in New York, in Berlin, in all the great cities of the world, masses of people who are claiming with violence what they call their rights and saying they must have them, and that another class is oppressing them; and danger lurks in every corner because men are insisting on Universal Brotherhood. This noble doctrine has already become a danger. The reason of all these things is that men have denied

the fact. Now, we propose to show you, if we can, that it is a fact.

If you will notice you will find that when it rains over a certain area vast numbers of men are affected similarly. The rain has to fall on the fields in order that the harvest may grow, so that afterwards it may be gathered, and all the farmers are affected together by the rain. If you examine society you will find that at the same hour every day almost all the people are doing exactly the same thing. At a certain hour in the morning thousands of your citizens are going down that railway or rush all together to catch the train, and at another few moments afterwards they are rushing out of the train to get to business, all doing the same thing, one common thought inspiring them. That is one of the proofs—a small one—in social and business life that they are affected together, they are all united. Then in the evening they will come home at the same hour, and if you could see, at the same hour you would see them all eating together and digesting together, and then later on they are all lying down together at the same hour. Are they not united even in their social life? Brothers even in that?

What do we see here in business? Lately I have felt it; every man has felt it, and many women; doubtless all have felt it; lately we have had a financial crisis, perhaps have it yet, in which dollars have been scarce, during which men have discovered that there are only just so many dollars and half-dollars to each person in the country, and we have altogether been suffering from that panic all over this vast country. Suffering, why? Because commercially we are united and cannot get out of it. China even is affected by it, and Japan. India, they say, was the cause of it. Some men say the reason for this panic is that India put the price of rupees down, and we who produce so much silver began to feel it. I do not know that that is the reason. But I think there is another cause. I think the American nation is so fond of luxury, so fond of fine clothes, so fond of having a heap of money, that it has gone too far and there was bound to come a reaction, because it is all united together with the whole world, and when it spread itself out too far the slightest touch broke the fabric. That is the reason, and that is another proof of Universal Brotherhood. We are all united, not only with each other here, but with the entire world.

Go further still, materially, and you will find that all men are alike. We have the same sort of bodies, a little different perhaps in height, weight, and extension, but as human beings we are all alike, all the

some color in one country, all the same shape in any country, so that as mere bodies of flesh they are united, they are the same. We know every man and woman has exuding from him or her what is called perspiration. The doctors will tell you there is a finer perspiration you cannot see, the invisible perspiration which goes out a short distance around about us; we know it comes out from every person, and the emanations of each person are affecting every other person, being interchanged always. All those in this room are being affected by these emanations and also by the ideas of each other, and the ideas of the speakers speaking to you. So it is in every direction; wherever you go, wherever you look, we are united; in whatever plane, the plane of mind as well as the plane of the body; the plane of the emotions, of the spirit, what not, we are all united, and it is a fact from which we cannot escape.

Further: science is beginning to admit what the old Theosophists have always said, that there is going on every minute in every person a death, a dissolution, a disappearance. It used to be taught and thought in the West that we could see matter, that this table is made of matter. It is admitted to-day by your best scientific men in every part of Western civilization that you do not see matter at all; it is only the phenomena of matter we see; and it is my senses which enable me to perceive these phenomena. It is not matter at all, and so we do not see matter. Now admitting that, they go further and say there is a constant change in matter, so-called; that is; this table is in motion. This is not a purely Theosophical theory. Go to any doctor of Physics and he will admit to you as I have stated it. This table is in motion; every molecule is separate from every other, and there is space between them, and they are moving. So it is with every man; he is made of atoms and they are in motion. Then how is it we remain the same size and weight nearly always from the moment of maturity until death? We eat tons of meat and vegetables but remain the same. It is not because of the things you have eaten. In addition to that, the atoms are alive, constantly moving, coming and going from one person to another: this is the modern doctrine to-day as well as it was the doctrine of ancient India. They call it the momentary dissolution of atoms; that is to say, to put it in another way, I am losing, all of you in this room are losing, a certain number of atoms, but they are being replaced by other atoms.

Where do these other atoms come from? Do they not come from the people in this room? These atoms help to rebuild your body as well

as does the food you eat. And we are exuding atoms from our minds, and we are receiving into ourselves the atoms other men have used. For, remember, science teaches you, and Theosophy has always insisted, that matter is invisible before it is turned into this combination of the life cycle, which makes it visible, makes it tangible to us. So these atoms leave us in a stream and rush into other people. And therefore the atoms of good men go into bad men, the atoms impressed by bad men go into good men, and *vice versa.* In that way as well as others we are affecting everybody in this world; the people in Chicago who are living mean, selfish lives are impressing these invisible atoms with mean and selfish characters, and these mean and selfish atoms will be distributed by other men, and by you again to your and their detriment. That is another phase of Universal Brotherhood. It teaches us to be careful to see that we use and keep the atoms in our charge in such a condition that they shall benefit others to whom they shall go.

There is another view of Universal Brotherhood, and I don't pretend to exhaust the argument on this point, for I have not the time nor force to state all that is put forward in the Theosophical books and literature and thought. That is, that there is in this world an actual Universal Brotherhood of men and women, of souls—a brotherhood of beings who practice Universal Brotherhood by always trying to influence the souls of men for their good. I bring to you the message of these men; I bring to you the words of that brotherhood. Why will you longer call yourselves miserable men and women who are willing to go to a Heaven where you will do nothing? Do you not like to be gods? Do you not want to be gods? I hear some men say, "What, a god! Impossible!" Perhaps they do not like the responsibility. Why, when you get to that position you will *understand* the responsibility. This actual Brotherhood of living men says, Men of the West, why will you so long refuse to believe you are gods? We are your brothers and we are gods with you. Be then as gods! Believe that you are gods, and then, after experience and attainment, you will have a place consciously in the great Brotherhood which governs the entire world, but cannot go against the law. This great Brotherhood of living men, living souls, would, if they could, alter the face of civilization; they would, if they could, come down and make saints of every one of you; but evolution is the law and they cannot violate it; they must wait for you. And why will you so long be satisfied to believe that you are born in original sin and cannot

escape? I do not believe in any such doctrine as that. I do not believe I was born in original sin. I believe that I am pretty bad, but that potentially I am a god, and I propose to take the inheritance if it is possible. For what purpose? So that I may help all the rest to do the same thing, for that is the law of Universal Brotherhood; and the Theosophical Society wishes to enforce it on the West, to make it see this great truth, that we are gods, and are only prevented from being so in fact by our own insanity, ignorance, and fear to take the position.

So, then, we insist that Universal Brotherhood is a fact in nature. It is a fact for the lowest part of nature; for the animal kingdom, for the vegetable kingdom, and the mineral kingdom. We are all atoms, obeying the law together. Our denying it does not disprove it. It simply puts off the day of reward and keeps us miserable, poor, and selfish. Why, just think of it! If all in Chicago, in the United States, would act as Jesus has said, as Buddha has said, as Confucius said, as all the great ethical teachers of the world have said, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you," would there be any necessity for legal measures and policemen with clubs in this park as you had them the other day? No, I think there would be no necessity, and that is what one of this great Brotherhood has said. He said all the troubles of the world would disappear in a moment if men would only do one-quarter of what they could and what they ought. It is not God who is to damn you to death, to misery. It is yourself.

The Theosophical Society desires above all things, not that you should understand spiritualism, not that wonderful occult works should be performed, but to understand the constitution of matter and of Life as they are, which we can never understand but by practicing right ethics. Live with each other as brothers; for the misery and the trouble of the world are of more importance than all the scientific progress that may be imagined. I conclude by calling upon you by all that humanity holds dear to remember what I say, and whether Christians, Atheists, Jews, Pagans, Heathen, or Theosophists, try to practice Universal Brotherhood, which is the universal duty of all men.

AN EXTRAORDINARY "SAINT"

THERE are probably few individuals among adherents of the authoritarian religious creeds upon whom H. P. Blavatsky would have bestowed the honor—had she possessed the means of doing so—of erecting a statue in his name. Joseph de Veuster (Father Damien), the simple Belgian priest, who, as a young man of thirty, offered the whole of his life in sacrifice for the alleviation of the sufferings of the lepers at Molokai, is an exception. There are a number of instances in the history of human kind of absolute, conscious sacrifice of one's self for the benefit of the many, but none more humane or touching, perhaps, than that of Damien.

In her *Key to Theosophy*, in the section "On Sacrifice," H. P. B. contrasts the self-abnegation of Damien with that of sincere but vainglorious missionaries who sacrificed their lives for a *sectarian* idea, such as that of saving the heathen from "damnation." Damien went alone to live for sixteen years in the colony of lepers, giving relief and relative happiness to thousands of miserable wretches. He brought to them consolation, mental and physical, and threw a streak of light into the black and dreary night of an isolated, hopeless existence. In the eyes of the Theosophist, this poor Belgian priest stands immeasurably higher than missionaries who go, in one case, to people who are not yet ripe for any truth and, in the other, to nations whose systems of religious philosophy are as grand as any to be found elsewhere. Whereas the missionaries with sectarian intentions died, in many instances, the victims of irresponsible savages, and of popular fanaticism and hatred, with nothing of value achieved, Damien died in the arms, metaphorically speaking, of those he lived to serve—not of the hatred of the men he went to help, but of the same loathsome disease they suffered—a "saint" in the minds and hearts of all.

Joseph de Veuster was born of Belgian peasants in 1840. He was a cheerful child, well liked. From the early years of his life he showed a sensitiveness to suffering. His parents hoped to have him become a businessman and sent him to a commercial school. Joseph, however, felt a strong desire to enter the priesthood and after much urging his parents gave their permission for him to join his brother in a monastery. Both he and his brother longed to be missionaries and, as it turned out,

Joseph, now Father Damien, finally took his brother's place as a missionary to Hawaii, due to the latter's illness.

For nine years Father Damien worked in Hawaii with the devotion of one convinced that what he was doing was right. During the early part of his stay there, the Hawaiian government began rounding up all lepers and sending them to an island called Molokai, in an effort to reduce contagion. The lepers were taken from their families and sent to live on this barren island with very little in the way of physical attention and nothing of spiritual care and consolation. Damien's heart suffered for these unhappy people and for several years he longed to be able to help them. In 1873 his opportunity came, and without even waiting to pack his few possessions, he boarded a boat laden with lepers heading for the dreaded island.

The first night, and for many nights thereafter, he slept under the stars beneath a tree with nothing for strength except his oneness of purpose and his faith. When Damien arrived in Molokai conditions were frightful. The sufferers had had no one to care about them—and as leprosy causes an apathy to develop—they cared not about themselves. They lacked fresh water, slept on the ground, and had barely enough food and clothing. This in addition to being separated from loved ones and being doomed to die a horrible death. Damien began by attending to their physical needs—dressing their sores and himself administering to them in all ways. He took the more able-bodied of them and, finding a source of fresh water, dug channels to make water available. He began to build houses. It was only through example that he got the others to help along. He persuaded the Hawaiian government to send food and clothing and so improved their physical condition that, from a state of complete hopelessness, the lepers began to find solace in the companionship of a friend.

Damien worked with the lepers for twelve years before contracting the disease. Infected at last, he suffered for four years before his release came. During this time he maintained cheerfulness of mind, and worked as long as his strength permitted. Finally, in 1889, his body was laid to rest under the same tree which had been his first bed on Molokai sixteen years before. At the time of his death Father Damien had succeeded in building a hospital and with it obtained doctors, nurses, and priests. He had succeeded in getting the government to supply food and clothing in goodly amounts. The plight of the lepers on Molokai

at Damien's death was almost "pleasant" by comparison with what it had been when he came.

Since last century, a great deal has been done toward the treatment and cure of leprosy. Through reference to an old Buddhist manuscript, test and experiment has demonstrated that leprosy can be permanently cured by injections of an extract of chaulmoogra oil. But something of all that has been achieved can justly be attributed to the work of Damien. Except for his labor and sacrifice, the world might have done little to relieve the misery of these miserable and unfortunate sufferers.

Sometime after Damien's death the Reverend C. M. Hyde, a protestant minister in Honolulu, wrote a derogatory letter to a friend concerning Father Damien, trying to indicate that all that was attributed to the dead Father was not so—that he was dirty, coarse, and that he had gone to Molokai without orders, etc. Robert Louis Stevenson, happening upon the published letter, was quick to come to Damien's defense. The result was the famous "Open Letter to the Rev. Dr. Hyde of Honolulu." With fine eloquence and rare insight, Stevenson accuses Dr. Hyde of being jealous of Damien's heroism, and that from his rich mansion in Honolulu he secretly wished that he could be the doer of great deeds. Stevenson does not make a saint out of Damien—he acknowledges that he was a coarse peasant—stubborn and narrow in his view. But it is even a greater feat he performed, being thus human. It would have been easy to do what he did had he already been a saint! He accuses Dr. Hyde of never having had the courage to visit Molokai. Stevenson himself spent eight days and seven nights on the island and calls it "a pitiful place to visit and a hell to dwell in." He wrote:

> It is not the fear of possible infection. That seems a little thing when compared with the pain, the pity, and the disgust of the visitor's surroundings, and the atmosphere of affliction, disease, and physical disgrace in which he breathes. I do not think I am a man more than usually timid; but I never recall the days and nights I spent upon that island promontory . . . without heartfelt thankfulness that I am somewhere else . . . and when the *Molokii* bore me at last towards the outer world, I kept repeating to myself, with a new conception of their pregnancy, those simple words of the song - 'Tis the most distressful country that ever yet was seen.'
>
> And observe: that which I saw and suffered from was a settlement purged, bettered, beautified; the new village built, the hospital and the Bishop-home excellently arranged; the sisters, the doctor, and the missionaries, all indefatigable in their noble tasks. It was a different place

when Damien came there, and made his great renunciation, and slept that first night under a tree amidst his rotting brethren: alone with pestilence; and looking forward (with what courage, with what pitiful sinkings of dread, God only knows) to a lifetime of dressing sores and stumps.

In answer to Dr. Hyde's specific accusations, Stevenson replied:

Damien was *dirty*. He was. Think of the poor lepers annoyed with this dirty comrade! But the clean Dr. Hyde was at his food in a fine house.

Damien was *coarse*. It is very possible. You make us sorry for the lepers who had only a coarse old peasant for their friend and father. But you, who were so refined, why were you not there, to cheer them with the lights of culture? Or may I remind you that we have some reason to doubt if John the Baptist were genteel; and in the case of Peter, on whose career you doubtless dwell approvingly in the pulpit, no doubt at all he was a 'coarse, headstrong' fisherman! Yet even in our Protestant Bibles Peter is called Saint.

Damien was *headstrong*. I believe you are right again; and I thank God for his strong head and heart.

Damien was *bigoted*. I am not fond of bigots myself. . . . But what is meant by bigotry, that we should regard it as a blemish in a priest? Damien believed his own religion with the simplicity of a peasant or a child; as I would I could suppose that you do . . . But the point of interest in Damien, which has caused him to be so much talked about and made him at last the subject of your pen and mine, was that, in him, his bigotry, his intense and narrow faith, wrought potently for good, and strengthened him to be one of the world's heroes and exemplars.

Damien *was not sent to Molokai, but went there without orders.* Is this a misreading? or do you really mean the words for blame? I have heard Christ, in the pulpits of our Church, held up for imitation on the ground that His sacrifice was voluntary. Does Dr. Hyde think otherwise?

The life and work of Father Damien serves to point up, in striking sense, the oft-repeated questions, "What is a Theosophist?" and "Who is a Theosophist?" In spite of the crystal clear statement contained in the Declaration of the United Lodge of Theosophists that "it (the Lodge) regards as Theosophists all who are engaged in the true service of humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, condition or organization," perplexed inquirers, and possibly some associates of the Lodge, continue to think of Theosophy and its ideal in a limited, sectarian sense. How is the idea to be conveyed that the quality of the true Theosophist is to be found, not in what one *believes*, but in what he *is* and

what he *does?* It is not of final moment, in the realm of spiritual evolution, what one's religious beliefs may be—so long as he is sincere, devoted, and true to himself, so long as he works unselfishly for the good of others. H.P.B.'s commendation of Damien's great sacrifice, besides giving credit where credit is due, should demonstrate to all the unsectarian spirit of Theosophy and of its Teachers, and at the same time disabuse sectarian Theosophists of their exclusiveness.

If it is possible, without presumption, to epitomize the message of Theosophy brought to the world in 1875, it may be described as the message of self-sacrifice, and it was brought by those who had the right to speak and to be heard. Under that illumination, we come to understand that self-sacrifice is not one of the adornments of life, but an essence of life itself. Progress on the path of human evolution is not alone through the conflict of blind forces nor through the stresses of a ruthless necessity, but is guided, directed and sustained by sacrifice.

In every religious faith, as well as among people belonging to none, there must be true and sincere servants of mankind. In spite of Damien's sectarian affiliations, and of the Rev. Hyde's charge of bigotry (which is questionable), there can be little doubt that here was a true lover of his fellow men, who sacrificed himself, not because of his creed, but because of his humanity. "He was a true Theosophist," said H. P. Blavatsky, "and his memory will live for ever in our annals . . . Had we the means to do so, we would raise a statue to Father Damien, the true, practical saint, and perpetuate his memory for ever as a living exemplar of Theosophical heroism and of Buddha- and Christ-like mercy and self-sacrifice."

THEOSOPHIST IS WHO THEOSOPHY DOES.

THE CHRIST SYMBOL

If it is true that Christ is the Son of Man, it is equally true that all the sons of men are Christian, in so far as this word signifies a belief in the redemption of man through love and death. From this standpoint it makes no difference whether a man calls himself Mohammedan, Jew or Christian, or even that he is registered as an atheist or a totemist. One may go even farther and say that no man can fail to be the Christ, whatever may be his conscious beliefs. In the depths, religion is as little concerned with dogmas as faith is with particular beliefs.

—GEORG GRODDECK: *The World of Man*

QUESTION—AND COMMENT

DISCUSSION of the pamphlet The United Lodge of Theosophists: Its Mission and Its Future—*such as was attempted by one study class recently—should inevitably lead to an analysis of the conception of "authority" in relation to Theosophical teachers. For instance, on page 21, it is stated that "the Parent Lodge at Los Angeles specifically and absolutely disclaims any authority over or responsibility for any other Lodge or any Associate." Previously, however, under the reading "Support and Direction of the United Lodge," it is remarked that "it was recognized that the assumption of responsibility without power or knowledge could only result in dissipation of energies and consequent loss."*

Those who "assume responsibility" might certainly be thought to acquire a measure of "authority" in the direction of Theosophical activities. Yet an earlier section of the pamphlet speaks of authority in still a different way by stating that, in ULT study, "the only 'authority' is the recorded Teaching as found in the books and articles of the Teachers."

No doubt a number of meanings are implied by the word "authority." One of the definitions supplied by *Webster's Unabridged* is: "power derived from opinion, respect [or] esteem, influence of character." The word is clearly a derivative of "author" which comes from the Latin *auctor,* meaning "to increase or produce." Therefore anyone who originates a line of endeavor is an authority in the sense that he bears the responsibility of authorship or creation, so that what he has to say about the creation is of basic relevance. Shipley's *Dictionary of Word Origins* points out that "a man who increases something," as an author, may be referred to as an authority regarding such increase. So certainly it can be said that Robert Crosbie and the original Associates of ULT were authors of a new embodiment of Theosophical effort and that particular reference to Mr. Crosbie in regard to the ULT intent follows the natural authority of *inauguration*—also a related word.

In *Escape from Freedom,* Erich Fromm discusses attitudes toward authority. He writes that "there is a fundamental difference between a kind of superiority-inferiority relation which can be called rational authority and one which may be described as inhibiting authority." Dr. Fromm continues:

> An example will show what I have in mind. The relationship between teacher and student and that between slave owner and slave are both based on the superiority of the one over the other. The interests of teacher and pupil lie in the same direction. The teacher is satisfied if he succeeds in furthering the pupil; if he has failed to do so, the failure is his and the pupil's. The slave owner, on the other hand, wants to exploit the slave as much as possible; the more he gets out of him, the more he is satisfied.
>
> The dynamics of authority in these two types are different too: the more the student learns, the less wide is the gap between him and the teacher. He becomes more and more like the teacher himself. In other words, the authority relationship tends to dissolve itself. But when the superiority serves as a basis for exploitation, the distance becomes intensified through its long duration.

In this context, it is not difficult to trace *both* types of authority-embodiment throughout the course of Theosophical history since 1875. Those who have sought leaders, or who have flocked to men and women already self-established as authorities, are those who, in Fromm's terms, wanted an "escape from freedom." The leader complex originates in "the tendency to give up the independence of one's own individual self and to fuse one's self with somebody or something outside of oneself in order to acquire the strength which the individual self is lacking," hence "the attempt to become a part of a bigger and more powerful whole outside of oneself, to submerge and participate in it." Dr. Fromm then touches on that aspect of the typically religious temperament which makes a closed-minded definition of authority, and ends with an almost totally closed mind on the part of the devotees. Fromm proceeds:

> This power can be a person, an institution, God, the nation, conscience, or a psychic compulsion. By becoming part of a power which is felt as unshakably strong, eternal, and glamorous, one participates in its strength and glory. One surrenders one's own self and renounces all strength and pride connected with it, one loses one's integrity as an individual and surrenders freedom; but one gains a new security and a new pride in the participation in the power in which one submerges. One gains also security against the torture of doubt. He is also saved from the doubt of what the meaning of his life is or who "he" is. These questions are answered by the relationship to the power to which he has attached himself.
>
> The authoritarian character does not lack activity, courage, or belief. But these qualities for him mean something entirely different from what they mean for the person who does not long for submission. For the authoritarian character activity is rooted in a basic feeling of power-

> lessness which it tends to overcome. Activity in this sense means to act in the name of something higher than one's own self. It is possible in the name of God, the past, nature, or duty, but never in the name of the future, of the unborn, of what has no power, or of life as such. The authoritarian character wins his strength to act through his leaning on superior power.

A true "authority," recognized by most students of ULT, is that of authorship. But the particular authors known to us as H.P.B., W.Q.J., and R.C. are completely nonsectarian. From the basic statement of the Third Fundamental Proposition of *The Secret Doctrine* through Judge's *Letters That Have Helped Me* and *Notes on the Bhagavad-Gita,* to Mr. Crosbie's published correspondence in *The Friendly Philosopher,* the influence is toward arousal of the individual will through "self-induced and self-devised efforts." And it is in this context, certainly, that one must regard the largely spontaneous origins of new centers of ULT study. When a Lodge comes into being, it does not come by way of some sort of "organizational expansion" from a center known as the Parent Lodge, but from the determination on the part of an individual or individuals to add to the "authorship" of Theosophical teachers their own "increase" through promulgation. While authoritarian tendencies may exist or persist in the human beings who work according to the method of ULT, they are bound to be diminished by that very method, since so little is offered in the way of "power" or even personal recognition. If the going is difficult between new students who come together to form a Lodge and if the inaugurating person or persons conceivably provide too much "direction," it must be remembered that the modulus of ULT has enabled such situations to work themselves into a true associative harmony with a continual "increase," also, in the sharing of responsibility.

Recently, a contributor to THEOSOPHY unearthed a hitherto unpublished paragraph by William Q. Judge on the subject of authority and successorship printed in the New York *Daily Tribune* for May 9, 1891, on the occasion of Madame Blavatsky's death, in the form of an interview. Judge said:

> We have known that Madame Blavatsky has been an invalid for a long time, and it was only her indomitable pluck and endurance that have kept her alive so long. Up to her death she was working heart and soul for the cause for which she so ably preached. It is of course a shock to us, and I, who have known her intimately for years, have lost a

dear friend. She can have no successor. Of course somebody will be elected president of the European Theosophical Societies, but that is only a mundane matter. In the spiritual sense nobody can succeed her. . . . The death of Madame Blavatsky will have no effect upon the movement here. We shall work as diligently as ever and try to carry out her teaching and wishes.

Genuine authority, like genuine authorship, carries its own credentials and is represented by the power of ideation, rather than by the power of manipulation. On this view, there are certain "authorities" which lead, educatively, away from all conceptions of external power or provincial partisanship. In a classical work titled *Human Personality and its Survival of Bodily Death,* first written by Prof. F. W. H. Myers in 1903 and recently republished, the Theosophical student may note the way in which a genuine philosophy of immortality leads away from the authority of manipulation toward the authority of ideation. Prof. Myers discusses the fear of death which inevitably follows when a man seeks his security in "tribal strength and cohesion." Myers writes:

Such fears, I say, vanish when we learn that it is the soul in man which links him with other souls; the body which dissevers even while it seems to unite; so that "no man liveth to himself nor dieth to himself," but in a sense which goes deeper than metaphor, "We are every one members one of another." Like atoms, like suns, like galaxies, our spirits are systems of forces which vibrate continually to each other's attractive power.

All this as yet is dimly adumbrated; it is a first hint of a scheme of thought which it may well take centuries to develop. But can we suppose that, when once this conception of the bond between all souls has taken root, men will turn back from it to the old exclusiveness, the old controversy? Will they not see that this world-widening knowledge is both old and new, that always have such revelations been given, but develop now into a mightier meaning,—with the growth of wisdom in those who send them, and in us who receive?

Surely we have here a conception, at once wider and exacter than ever before, of that "religious education of the world" on which theologians have been fain to dwell. We need assume no "supernatural interference," no "plan of redemption." We need suppose only that the same process which we observe to-day has been operating for ages.

Clarification on the matter of "authority" seems to be one of the central labors of the Theosophical Movement in any age. Yet it is never for the Theosophical student to press his own idea of devotion upon

others. At the conclusion of the H.P.B. compilation, *What is Theosophy? Its Nonsectarian Spirit,* Madame Blavatsky speaks with obvious application to the subject of "authority":

> Concerning the deeper spiritual, and one may almost say religious, beliefs, no true Theosophist ought to degrade these by subjecting them to public discussion, but ought rather to treasure and hide them deep within the sanctuary of his innermost soul. . . . A ray from the absolute truth can reflect itself only in the pure mirror of its own flame—our highest Spiritual Consciousness.

The crucial question in respect to "authority" is whether one wishes to *possess* an authority who will take over the responsibility for one's own acts—or one's beliefs. It is this sort of authority which Theosophical teachers have consistently refused to accept. The Theosophical student, in parallel fashion, endeavors to become sufficiently self-reliant so as not to request such "ceremonial and adventitious" aid. In any case, arguments about the relative virtues of proposed or pretended authorities, within the Theosophical Movement, are clearly inappropriate, as H.P.B.'s words imply.

TOWARD FREEDOM

Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.

Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.

Everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his personality is possible. In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society.

—*Universal Declaration of Human Rights.*

THE HUMAN FORM

THE great mystery surrounding the origin and evolution of our human form has intrigued the minds of thinkers since the remotest periods of time. How did the human form come to be? Was it always so perfectly proportioned, as carved by sculptors of antiquity, and as pictured by generations of skilled artists, and as so nobly described by poets and others throughout our long human history on this planet?

Where are the right answers as to the *how* and *whence* and *wherefore* concerning the actual development of the human form and its embodiment up to now? The scientists and learned men simply do not know. And, in some respects, as H.P.B. has said, "for the Western mind . . . no explanation can be attempted for those who are not students of Occult metaphysics."

Alone in the teachings of Theosophy, say its students, is to be discovered what is sought—because the ancient Eternal Wisdom Religion contains a *unifying* synthesis of knowledge and understanding.

A good first key to a partial uncovering of the mystery veiling the truth concerning the form of man was recently proposed in an article in the Sunday New York *Times Magazine* of Jan. 21, 1962. Seeking to find plausible answers in his article, "Fearfully and Wonderfully Made," the author, Dr. Lewis Lasagna, after positing two questions—"Is the human body an efficient mechanism?" and "Would it be possible to design a better one?"—himself states that "it is in the extraordinary *coordination* of its parts that the human body excels as a machine." (Italics ours). Whether or not the learned doctor intuitively realized the key was in the idea of hierarchies of intelligences working together in unison is not known; but he approached close to a Theosophic understanding.

In another area, in an article signed by John Lear, Science Editor, in the *Saturday Review* of Feb. 3, 1962, discussing magnetism and certain lines of force that seemingly assume "a surrealist sketch of a man cradling his head in his arms," the author bluntly states, "no one knows how or why the body of the human species came to be shaped as it is."

Theosophically, man would never achieve capstones of knowledge on any subject, were it not for invisible help extended Mankind from behind the scenes by the great Compassionators—Elder Brothers who, as the Perfected Beings and Masters of Wisdom, continually project from

the unseen but real world of Ideas, these eternal truths "for the experience and emancipation of the soul." And these truths are primarily concerned historically, not only with the very beginnings of our universe, the formative or plastic or, as known in theosophic parlance as "astral" evolution, but more precisely, with the gradually evolving and ultimate perfecting of the many phases of our own Humanity, throughout interminable Cycles, Rounds and Races.

Therefore, if one would wish to know "How man came to be the complex being that he is and why," he must be prepared to approach the study of the vast field of evolution from the highest point of view. And to do so requires the enquirer to bear in mind that Man "in his real nature is a unity." Also, as H.P.B. declared, no ultimate understanding can be achieved "unless the student makes himself familiar with the mystery of evolution, which proceeds in triple lines—spiritual, psychic and physical." And the Ariadne's thread in the vast labyrinth of evolution is Man himself. Yet, in compiling his store of knowledge, the student is told that it is "great souls, high and holy men of immense power, knowledge and wisdom," as Mr. Judge says, "the *Dhyanis,* the Creators, the Guides, the Great Spirits" who are engaged in work of "often altering" and also that "they gradually transform by such alteration and addition the kingdoms of nature as well as the gradually forming gross body of man."

The general laws to be known are clearly given in *The Ocean of Theosophy* by Mr. Judge, who graphically refers to the shape, form and construction of the human body as "the story of the building of Solomon's Temple from the heterogeneous materials brought from everywhere and its erection without the noise of a tool being heard." Here we enter an area of mystery, hopefully intent on discovering some of the clues locked in the bosom of time.

There is of course, no set of arbitrary rules which the student must follow in this study, but the following (*S.D.* I, 183.) may help:

> Every form on earth, and every speck (atom) in Space strives in its efforts towards self-formation to follow the model placed for it in the 'HEAVENLY MAN.' . . . Its (the atom's) involution and evolution, its external and internal growth and development, have all one and the same object—man; man, as the highest physical and ultimate form on this earth; the MONAD, in its absolute totality and awakened condition —as the culmination of the divine incarnations on Earth.

> Physical nature, the great combination of physical correlations of forces, ever creeping onward towards perfection, has to avail herself of the material at hand; she models and remodels as she proceeds, and finishing her crowning work in man, presents him alone as a fit tabernacle for the overshadowing of the divine Spirit. (*S.D.* I, 185 fn.)
>
> II Round. He (Man) is still gigantic and ethereal but growing firmer and more condensed in body, a more physical man. Yet still less intelligent than spiritual, for mind is a slower and more difficult evolution than is the physical frame . . ." (*S.D.* I, 188.)

To return for a moment to the *Times* article by Dr. Lasagna, we can remind ourselves that, as he holds, "it is in the extraordinary coordination of its parts that the human body excels as a machine." And also, as he wrote, "This may not be the best of possible worlds but is far from the worst." Further; "The achievement of a happier world by a purposeful redesign of the human brain is beyond even our dreams at present." So, "It would . . . appear unlikely that science will soon conjure up either brain or bodies that are great improvements over the remarkable protoplasmic machines that nature has evolved for us." Therefore—to consider his reference to the Old Testament words—"I am fearfully and wonderfully made," as man is described in the Bible, or "the suggestion that the heart might be replaced by machinery" which "raises the question: Can the human body be improved?" or "Is the human body an efficient mechanism?" and "Would it be possible to design a better one?", we need but read in the *Secret Doctrine*:

> How comes our physical body to the state of perfection it is found in now? Through millions of years of evolution, of course, yet never through, or from, animals, as taught by materialism. For, as Carlyle says: "The essence of our being, the mystery in us that calls itself 'I,'—what words have we for such things?—it is a breath of Heaven, the highest Being reveals himself in man. This body, these faculties, this life of ours, is it not all as a vesture for the UNNAMED?"
>
> The *breath* of heaven, or rather the breath of life, called in the Bible *Nepesh,* is in every animal, in every animate speck as in every mineral atom. But none of these has, like man, the consciousness of the nature of that highest Being, as none has that divine harmony in its form which man possesses. It is, as Novalis said, and no one since has said it better, as repeated by Carlyle:—
>
> "There is but one temple in the universe, and that is the body of man. Nothing is holier than that high form . . . We touch heaven when we lay our hand on a human body!" "This sounds like a mere flourish of rhetoric," adds Carlyle, "but it is not so. If well meditated it will

> turn out to be a scientific fact; the expression . . . of the actual truth of the thing. We are the miracle of miracles,—the great inscrutable Mystery." (*S.D.* I, 211-12.)

At this point we may turn to a correlative idea expressed by Leonardo da Vinci:

> Our body is dependent on heaven and heaven on the Spirit. The motive power is the cause of all life. And you, O Man, who will discern in this work of mine the wonderful works of Nature, if you think it would be a criminal thing to destroy it, reflect how much more criminal it is to take the life of a man; and if this, his external form, appears to thee marvelously constructed, remember that it is nothing as compared with the soul that dwells in that structure; for that indeed, be it what it may, is a thing divine. Leave it then to dwell in His work at His good will and pleasure, and let not your rage of nature destroy a life—for, indeed, he who does not value it, does not himself deserve it.

As *The Secret Doctrine* (II, 728) says:

> Man is certainly *no* special creation, and he is the product of Nature's gradual perfective work, like any other living unit on this Earth. But this is only with regard to the human tabernacle. That which lives and thinks in man and survives that frame, the masterpiece of evolution —is the "Eternal Pilgrim," the Protean differentiation in space and time of the One Absolute "unknowable."

SPECIAL BRAIN

The life force says to the philosopher: I have done a thousand wonderful things unconsciously by merely willing to live and following the line of least resistance: Now I want to know myself and my destination, and choose my path; so I have made a special brain—a philosopher's brain—to grasp this knowledge for me as the husbandman's hand grasps the plow for me.

I tell you that as long as I can conceive something better than myself I cannot be easy unless I am striving to bring it into existence or clearing the way for it.

—GEORGE BERNARD SHAW

YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK— AND ANSWER

MANY young people in their quest for "identity," and perhaps in search of some spiritual relationship with the world, feel it necessary to break away from family ties. Is this unfortunate and often tragic separation really necessary for the fulfillment of one's individual destiny?

Ideally, perhaps, a person's individual destiny and that of his family should not come into conflict. In the article, "Living the Higher Life," it is stated that in a Golden Age egos come together in a family to help each other not only physically but spiritually as well. Today, however, in *Kali Yuga,* it often seems as though the opposite were true. After all, love is not the only emotion that brings egos together in a family; often we come together to pay old debts to one another, to resolve ancient hostilities. This process, certainly, is far from pleasant; yet it would seem to be necessary if spiritual progress is ever to be made. In fact it is *through* this process that we progress. Some of the deepest lessons can be learned only through the tumult and harassment of family life.

Yet a blanket statement, such as "the debts must be paid," cannot helpfully cover every individual situation, and one may find oneself in a family which is not moving in one's own natural direction, and which is not sympathetic to one's highest aspirations. In such a case, one may find it necessary to break away in order to preserve one's spiritual integrity. And even when the family life is "normal," there still would seem to be may things which the individual must do alone. Is there not something awkward about a "family" in a museum, confronting a work of art together? And can a "family" go out on a mountain, and lie beneath the stars, and feel alive? And can a "family" discover a poet, or write a symphony? Speaking of young people who have left home, Rilke says, ". . . one wonders sometimes . . . whether it would not have been possible after all to remain at home. If only one could have been religious, sincerely religious, in tempo with the others. But it seemed so absurd, to try doing that in common. The path has somehow grown narrower: families can no longer approach God." From this point of view, it is little wonder that Jesus, according to the Bible, was always alone when

praying, as for instance (Matt. 14:23): "And when he had sent the multitudes away, he went up into a mountain apart to pray: and when the evening was come he was there alone (see also THEOSOPHY 50:405).

We know that Buddha left home—and not only home but a kingdom—in order to fulfill a greater duty than that he owed his family. H.P.B. left both family and country, and traveled through the remote parts of the earth, eventually founding the Theosophical Society in a country and language that were foreign to her. Is there no analogy to be found between the lives of these beings and our own, despite the fact that we have no great immediate mission to the world? Perhaps there is, if we consider that every soul has its own definite mission in every life. These greater souls went out to find and fulfill their missions, and so must we find ours; and (as it happened with them) it may be that this process will require a person to leave his family for a while. On the other hand, it certainly seems that at our stage a definite part of our mission is to harmonize our family situation, to leave no obligations unfulfilled. Egos are brought together in a family for deep and definite reasons, and must work out their collective as well as individual destinies.

One must in all cases try to do what is necessary and just; that is to say, to evaluate the real needs of the situation, and determine which needs are greater—his own or others'—and in what ways they are different. One would think that by fulfilling *any* need, including his own, to find his relationship to the world, he cannot help but raise the level of his family, whose progress is, after all, dependent upon the efforts of its individual members. And certainly if one is successful in discovering a basic relationship between himself and *any* others, he will have gone far in discovering his own real place in the family. Thus it would seem that insights into the truths of family life are insights into global, even cosmic, truths, and vice versa, and that both sorts simply represent insights into oneself.

SYMBOLIC EVOLUTION

IN Evolution, as it is now beginning to be understood, there is supposed to be in all matter an impulse to take a higher form; a supposition clearly expressed by Manu and other Hindu philosophers of the highest antiquity. The philosopher's tree illustrates it in the case of the zinc solution. The controversy between the followers of this school and the Emanationists may be briefly stated thus: The Evolutionists stop at the borders of "the Unknowable"; the Emanationists believe that nothing can be evolved—or, as the word means, unwombed or born—except it has first been involved, thus indicating that life is from a spiritual potency above the whole.

So-called exact science holds but to a one-sided physical evolution, prudently avoiding and ignoring the higher or spiritual evolution, which would force our contemporaries to confess the superiority of the ancient philosophers and psychologists over themselves. The ancient Sages, ascending to the UNKNOWABLE, made their starting-point from the first manifestation of the unseen, the unavoidable, and from a strict logical reasoning, the absolutely necessary creating Being, the Demiurgos of the universe. Evolution began for them from pure spirit, which, descending lower and lower down, assumed at last a visible and comprehensible form, and became matter. Arrived at this point, they speculated in the Darwinian method, but on a far more large and comprehensive basis.

If the Pythagorean metempsychosis should be thoroughly explained and compared with the modern theory of evolution, it would be found to supply every "missing link" in the chain of the latter. The harmony and mathematical equiformity of the double evolution—spiritual and physical—are elucidated only in the universal numerals of Pythagoras, who built his system entirely upon the so-called "metrical speech" of the Hindu Vedas. In both the Pythagorean and the Brahmanical systems, the esoteric significance is derived from the number: in the former, from the mystic relation of every number to everything intelligible to the human mind; in the latter, from the number of syllables of which each verse in the *Mantras* consists. Plato, the ardent disciple of Pythagoras, realized it so fully as to maintain that the Dodecahedron was the geometrical figure employed by the Demiurgos in constructing the universe.

NOTE.—Collated from *Isis Unveiled*.

Pythagoras brought his doctrines from the eastern sanctuaries, and Plato compiled them into a form more intelligible than the mysterious numerals of the Sage—whose doctrines he had fully embraced—to the uninitiated mind. With Plato, the Primal Being is an emanation of the Demiurgic Mind (Nous), which contains from the eternity the "*Idea*" of the "to be created world" within itself, and which he produces out of himself. The laws of nature are the established relation of this *Idea* to the forms of its manifestations. "The incorporeal world then was already completed, having its seat in the Divine Reason," says Philo, who is erroneously accused of deriving his philosophy from Plato. Creation, being proportional to the power of the Creator, the universe as well as its Creator must be infinite and eternal, one form emanating from its own essence, and creating in its turn another.

The evolution-hypothesis of the old Brahmans was embodied by them in the allegory of the mundane tree. The Hindus represent their mythical tree, which they call *Aswatha,* in a way which differs from that of the Scandinavians (the ash, or *Yggdrasil*). It is described by them as growing in a reversed position, the branches extending downward and the roots upward; the former typifying the external world of sense, *i.e.,* the visible cosmical universe, and the latter the invisible world of spirit, because the roots have their genesis in the heavenly regions where, from the world's creation, humanity has placed its invisible Deity.

The Egyptian pyramid also symbolically represents this idea of the mundane tree. Its apex is the mystic link between heaven and earth, and stands for the root, while the base represents the spreading branches, extending to the four cardinal points of the universe of matter. It conveys the idea that all things had their origin in spirit—evolution having originally begun from above and proceeded downward, instead of the reverse, as taught in the Darwinian theory. In other words, there has been a gradual materialization of forms until a fixed ultimate of debasement is reached. This point is that at which the doctrine of modern evolution enters into the arena of speculative hypothesis.

"As above, so it is below. That which has been, will return again. As in heaven, so on earth." Is it too much to believe that man should be developing new sensibilities and a closer relation with nature? The logic of evolution must teach as much if carried to its legitimate conclusion. As our planet revolves once every year around the sun and at the same time turns once every twenty-four hours upon its own axis,

thus traversing minor cycles within the larger one, so is the work of the smaller cyclic periods accomplished and recommenced, within the Great *Saros*. The revolution of the physical world, according to the ancient doctrine, is attended by a like revolution in the world of intellect—the spiritual evolution of the world proceeding in cycles, like the physical one. Thus we see in history a regular alternation of ebb and flow in the tide of human progress. The great kingdoms and empires of the world, after reaching the culmination of their greatness, descend again, in accordance with the same law by which they ascended; till, having reached the lowest point, humanity reasserts itself and mounts up once more, the height of its attainment being, by this law of ascending progression by cycles, somewhat higher than the point from which it had before descended.

Modern science insists upon the doctrine of evolution; so do human reason and the Secret Doctrine, and the idea is corroborated by the ancient legends and myths and even by the Bible itself when it is read between the lines. We see a flower slowly developing from a bud, and the bud from its seed. But whence the latter, with all its predetermined programme of physical transformations, and its invisible, therefore *spiritual,* forces which gradually develop its form, color, and odor? The word "evolution" speaks for itself. The germ of the present human race must have pre-existed in the parent of this race, as the seed, in which lies hidden the flower of the next summer, was developed in the capsule of its parent-flower: the parent may be slightly different, but it still differs from its future progeny. The creative energy having originated in the primordial point, the religious symbols of every people are so many illustrations of this metaphysical hypothesis expounded by Pythagoras, Plato, and other philosophers.

We may add, as a fact of interest, that this ancient theory of evolution is not only embalmed in allegory and legend, but also depicted upon the walls of certain temples in India, and, in a fragmentary form, has been found in those of Egypt and on the slabs of Nimrod and Nineveh excavated by Layard. Inorganic as well as organic matter possesses a particle of the *divine* essence in itself, however infinitesimally small it may be. And how could it be otherwise? Notwithstanding that in the progress of its evolution it may from beginning to end have passed through millions of various forms, it must ever retain its germ-point of that *pre-existent* matter, which is the first manifestation and emanation

of the Deity itself. What is then this inexplicable power of attraction but an atomical portion of that essence that scientists and kabalists equally recognize as the "principle of life"—the *Akasha?* As we ascend in the scale of organic beings in nature, we find this principle of life developing attributes and faculties which become more determined and marked with every rung of the endless ladder. Man, the most perfect of organized beings on earth, in whom matter and spirit—*i.e., will*—are the most developed and powerful, is alone allowed to give a conscious impulse to that principle which emanates from him; and only he can impart to the magnetic fluid opposite and various impulses without limit as to the direction.

Before any of our modern teachers thought of evolution, the ancients taught us, through Hermes, that nothing can be abrupt in nature. That she never proceeds by jumps and starts, that everything in her works in slow harmony, and that there is nothing sudden—not even violent death. The slow development from pre-existing forms was a doctrine of the Rosicrucian Illuminati. As by gradual progression from the star-cloudlet to the development of the physical body of man, the rule holds good, so from the universal ether to the incarnate human spirit, they traced one uninterrupted series of entities. These evolutions were from the world of spirit into the world of gross matter; and through that back again to the source of things. The "descent of species" was to them a descent from the spirit, primal source of all, to the "degradation of matter." In this complete chain of unfoldings the elementary, spiritual beings had a distinct place, midway between the extremes, as Mr. Darwin's missing-link between the ape and man.

What is the WILL? Can exact science tell? What is the nature of that intelligent, intangible, and powerful something which reigns supreme over all inert matter: The great Universal Idea willed, and the cosmos sprang into existence. I *will,* and my limbs obey. I *will,* and my thought traverses space, which does not exist for it, envelopes the body of another individual who is not a part of myself, penetrates through his pores, and, superseding his own faculties, if they are weaker, forces him to a predetermined action.

Schopenhauer's doctrine is that the universe is but the manifestation of the will. Every force in nature is also an effect of will, representing a higher or lower degree of its objectiveness. It is the teaching of Plato, who stated distinctly that everything visible was created or evolved out

of the invisible and eternal WILL, and after its fashion. Our heaven, he says, was produced according to the eternal pattern of the "Ideal World," contained, as everything else, in the Dodecahedron, the geometrical model used by the Deity. The will of the Creator, through which all things were made and received their first impulse, is the property of every living being. Man, endowed with an additional spirituality, has the largest share of it on this planet. It depends on the proportion of matter in him whether he will exercise its magical faculty with more or less success. Sharing this divine potency in common with every inorganic atom, he exercises it through the course of his whole life, whether consciously or otherwise. In the former case, when in the full possession of his powers, he will be the master, and the universal soul will be controlled and guided by him. In the case of animals, plants, minerals, and even the average of humanity, this ethereal fluid which pervades all things, finds no resistance, and being left to itself moves them as its impulse directs.

The Hermetists and later Rosicrucians held that all things visible and invisible were produced by the contention of light with darkness, and that every particle of matter contains within itself a spark of the divine essence, or light, *spirit*—which, through its tendency to free itself from its entanglement and return to the central source, produced motion in the particles, and from motion forms were born. Light is force, and the latter is produced by the *Will*. As this Will proceeds from an intelligence which cannot err, for it has nothing of the material organs of *human* thought in it, being the superfine emanation of the highest divinity itself (Plato's "Father"), it proceeds from the beginning of time according to immutable laws, to evolve the elementary fabric requisite for subsequent generation of what we term human races. All of the latter, whether belonging to this planet or to some other of the myriads in space, have their earthly bodies evolved in the matrix out of the bodies of a certain class of elemental beings which have passed away in the invisible worlds. In the ancient philosophy there was no missing link to be supplied by what Tyndall calls an "educated imagination"; no hiatus to be filled with volumes of materialistic speculations made necessary by the absurd attempt to solve an equation with but one set of quantities. Our "ignorant" ancestors traced the law of evolution throughout the whole universe.

Light is the great Protean magician, and under the Divine Will of the

architect, its multifarious, omnipotent waves gave birth to every form as well as to every living being. From its swelling electric bosom, springs *matter* and *spirit*. Within its beams lie the beginnings of all physical and chemical action, and of all cosmic and spiritual phenomena. It vitalizes and disorganizes, it gives life and produces death, and from its primordial point gradually emerged into existence the myriads of worlds, visible and invisible celestial bodies. If, out of the *material* portion of the ether, by virtue of the inherent restlessness of its particles, the forms of worlds and their species of plants and animals can be evolved, why, out of the *spiritual* part of the ether, should not successive races of beings, *from the stage of monad to that of man,* be developed; each lower form unfolding a higher one until the work of evolution is completed on our earth in the production of immortal man? The Hermetic, Orphic, and Pythagorean cosmogonical doctrines, as well as those of Sanchoniathon and Berosus are all based upon one irrefutable formula, viz.: that the ether and chaos, or, in the Platonic language, mind and matter, were the two primeval and eternal principles of the universe, utterly independent of anything else. The former was the all-vivifying intellectual principle; the chaos, a shapeless, liquid principle, without "form or sense," from the union of which two sprung into existence the universe, or rather, the universal world, the first androgynous deity—the chaotic matter becoming its body, and ether the soul.

Three spirits live in and actuate man, teaches Paracelsus; three worlds pour their beams upon him, but all three only as the image and echo of one and the same all-constructing and uniting principle of production. The first is the spirit of the elements (terrestrial body and vital force in its brute condition); the second, the spirit of the stars (sidereal or astral body—the soul); the third is the *Divine* spirit (*Augoeides*). "The Mundane God, eternal, boundless, young and old, of winding form," say the Chaldean oracles. This "winding form" is a figure to express the vibratory motion of the Astral Light, with which the ancient priests were perfectly well acquainted, though they may have differed in views of ether with modern scientists; for in the Æther they placed the Eternal Idea pervading the universe, or the *Will* which becomes *Force,* and creates or organizes matter.

Man is a little world—a microcosm inside the great universe. Like a foetus, he is suspended, by all his *three* spirits, in the matrix of the

macrocosmos; and while his terrestrial body is in constant sympathy with its parent earth, his astral soul lives in unison with the sidereal *anima mundi.* He is in it, as it is in him, for the world-pervading element fills all space, and *is* space itself, only shoreless and infinite. As to his third spirit, the divine, what is it but an infinitesimal ray, of the countless radiations proceeding directly from the Highest Cause—the Spiritual Light of the World? This is the trinity of organic and inorganic nature —the spiritual and the physical which are *three in one,* and of which Proclus says that "The first monad is the Eternal God; the second, eternity; the third, the paradigm, or pattern of the universe"; the three constituting the Intelligible Triad.

Everything in this visible universe is the outflow of this Triad, and a microcosmic triad in itself. And thus they move in majestic procession in the fields of eternity, around the Spiritual Sun, as in the heliocentric system the celestial bodies move round the visible sun. The Pythagorean *Monad,* which lives "in solitude and darkness," may remain on this earth forever invisible, impalpable, and undemonstrated by experimental science. Still the whole universe will be gravitating around it, as it did from the "beginning of time," and with every second, man and atom approach nearer to that solemn moment in the eternity, when the Invisible Presence will become clear to their spiritual sight. The Secret Doctrine teaches that man, *if he wins immortality,* will remain forever the trinity that he is in life, and will continue so throughout all the spheres. The astral body, which in this life is covered by a gross physical envelope, becomes—when relieved of that covering by the process of death—in its turn the shell of another and more ethereal body. This begins developing from the moment of death, and becomes perfected when the astral body of the earthly form finally separates from it. This process, they say, is repeated at every new transition from sphere to sphere. But the immortal soul, "the silvery spark" observed by Dr. Fenwick in Margrave's brain, and not found by him in the animals, never changes, but remains indestructible "by aught that shatters its tabernacle."

The essential is forever the same. Whether we cut away the marble inward that hides the statue in the block, or pile stone upon stone outward till the temple is completed, our *new* result is only an *old idea.* The latest of all the eternities will find its destined other half-soul in the earliest. Kingdoms have crumbled and nations succeeded nations from

the beginning until our day, the races alternately mounting up to the highest and descending to the lowest point of development. How analogous this theory to the law of planetary motion, which causes the individual orbs to rotate on their axes; the several systems to move round their respective suns; and the whole stellar host to follow a common path around a common centre. Life and death, light and darkness, day and night on the planet, as it turns about its axis and traverses the zodiacal circle representing the lesser and the greater cycles. The "coats of skin" mentioned in the third chapter of Genesis as given to Adam and Eve, are explained by certain ancient philosophers to mean the fleshy bodies with which, in the progress of the cycles, the progenitors of the race became clothed. They maintained that the god-like physical form became grosser and grosser, until the bottom of what may be termed the last spiritual cycle was reached, and mankind entered upon the ascending arc of the first human cycle.

Then began an uninterrupted series of cycles or yugas; the precise number of years of which each of them consisted remaining an inviolable mystery within the precincts of the sanctuaries and disclosed only to the initiates. As soon as humanity entered upon a new one, the stone age, with which the preceding cycle had closed, began to gradually merge into the following and next higher age. With each successive age, or epoch, men grew more refined, until the acme of perfection possible in that particular cycle had been reached. Then the receding wave of time carried back with it the vestiges of human, social, and intellectual progress. Cycle succeeded cycle, by imperceptible transitions; highly-civilized flourishing nations waxed in power, attained the climax of development, waned, and became extinct; and mankind, when the end of the lower cyclic arc was reached was replunged into barbarism as at the start.

When every particle of matter, even the most sublimated, has been cast off from the last shape that forms the ultimate link of that chain of double evolution which, throughout millions of ages and successive transformations, has pushed the entity onward; and when it shall find itself reclothed in that primordial essence, identical with that of its Creator, then this once impalpable organic atom will have run its race, and the sons of God will once more "shout for joy" at the return of the Pilgrim.

ON THE LOOKOUT

Psychoanalysis and Religion

Dr. Ira Progoff's book, *The Birth and Death of Psychology,* summarizes the ways in which certain of the leaders in the psychological sciences are now approaching aspects of the Theosophical point of view. The "psychologists" of the last century—with occasional exceptions such as George T. Ladd and William James—were strongly inclined to consider the mind (or soul) as an epiphenomenon. Causation was to be sought, not in the individual will of man, but in a determinism arranged by the interaction of heredity and environment. Professor John B. Watson's "Behaviorism" was a thoroughly materialistic valuation of the human being: man was not an *essence,* but a *thing.*

Erich Fromm's article "Man Is not a Thing," reprinted in Theosophy (46:35) from the *Saturday Review,* presented a new view, in some ways suggestive of a reformulation of ancient philosophy. In this instructive polemic and in his remarkable book *Psychoanalysis and Religion,* Dr. Fromm affirms that man is not a "thing," but an "essence"—that is, the mind or soul of the human being is not a creation but a creator, is primarily causal rather than the result of external causation. Other contemporary revaluations of psychoanalysis point to similar conclusions. It is beginning to be evident that a mature science of psychotherapy must not only be aware of its first principles, but also aware that the area of religion and philosophy and the area of mystical experience share the field with psychoanalysis in interpretation of ultimate meaning.

"The Analytic Attitude"

Under this title in *Encounter* for June, Philip Rieff undertakes to explain why Freud has so often been misused, for, in Mr. Rieff's opinion, Freud himself did not intend psychoanalysis to supply a philosophy of life. In other words, Freud, at least initially, had a rare reserve and endeavored to confine himself to the analytic attitude; he sought a discipline that would afford protection against the temptation to jump from analysis to the establishment of religion. Mr. Rieff introduces his discussion of Freud with a note on this point:

The religious question can be asked in various ways: in terms of the good, true, and beautiful (Socrates); by reference to how, and by whom, we are to be saved (Christ); through tracing a line of historical development towards justice (Marx). Because, as a therapist, he refused to ask the religious question, or announce a characterological ideal, Freud, earned the polemical hatred of Lawrence, Jung's schism, Reich's progressively more radical revisions. Try as he might, Reich could not avoid finding a theology at the end of his therapy, an ideal character at the end of his analytic theory. Reich's pathetic struggle to frame the great question in a scientific way illustrates how powerfully psychotherapy is tempted beyond the grim safety of diagnostic analysis into the creative danger of doctrinal synthesis.

Dilemma of an Analyst

On the other hand, Psychiatrist Allen Wheelis' *The Seeker,* a novel concerned with the interrelationship of philosophy and psychoanalysis, portrays a situation in which the analyst finds out that ultimate "meaning" cannot be revealed by the analytic method. Dr. Wheelis writes:

I have not found in psychoanalysis the meaning I sought. I function as guide to the lost, but do not myself know the way. I would escape this responsibility if I could, but have come a long way down this path to turn back now. And even if there were time, I wouldn't know what other path to take. Throughout my years of study I have been able to assume that later, when I understood more, I would find meaning. Now, as I have acquired proficiency, this hope has become untenable. There is much to learn and I could stay a student always, but I have come far enough on this road to see the end: no amount of study will gain me what I seek. I was a child and was led, a student and was taught; now I, blind man, act as seer. Most willingly would I relinquish this place, but those others who lead see no better than I. They may deny it, for blindness is most painful when combined with the obligation to lead; but I think they have dogma, not vision, and are as lost in this jungle as I.

A Transition Science

Mr. Rieff continues with his interpretation of various transitions which have occurred since Freud:

Freud knew that there is no longer, characteristically, in our culture, an effective community surrounding the individual, softening life often at the expense of stifling it and organising life often at the cost of making it rigid. Psycho-analysis supplied an individual and secular substitute for communal and religious vocation. Where nothing can be taken for granted, and the stupidity of social life no longer saves,

every man must become something of a genius about himself.

This is the reason psycho-analysis has appealed so to the intellectual. For there is a curious resemblance between the analyst and intellectual: both have the analytic attitude at the very basis of their vocations. Yet, precisely for this reason, both the analyst and intellectual must feel the futility built into their vocations.

The "Negative Community"

The analyst is useful and productive, but chiefly in negative terms. Yet he forms "a community of thought" and contributes a powerful influence upon culture, largely, it seems, because traditional influences have lost their relevance. Mr. Rieff continues:

> The classical communities, created within civilisations of authority, are disappearing—more accurately, they are becoming disfunctional. Freud understood this acutely, in his late essay on *Civilization and its Discontents*. Beyond the negative community all positive ones seem either fraudulent or stupid; nothing in psycho-analysis makes them any the less so. Psycho-analysis belongs to those who have experienced it, but first of all to the analysts who practise it. Thus the community is in the practice, and necessarily excludes those who are not practised, even the patients.
>
> In this sense it is not a science, nor even a transferable art, but depends, I imagine, uniquely on each therapeutic relation. It has nothing to say to the uninvolved, and less to say even to the patient as his involvement lessens and is finally displaced by the tricky memory of involvement.

"The World of Man"

An interesting quotation from Georg Grodeck's *The World of Man* indicates how a reinterpreted science of psychoanalysis and a revaluated religion are of necessity dealing with the same symbols:

> The sum total of an individual human being, psychical, mental, and spiritual, the organism with all its forces, the microcosmos, the universe which is a man, I conceive of as a self unknown and for ever unknowable, and I call this the It as the most indefinite term available without either emotional or intellectual associations. . . . Long before the brain comes into existence the It of man is already active and "thinking" without the brain, since it must first construct the brain. That is a fundamental point and one we are inclined to ignore or forget.
>
> So far from being irreligious, psycho-analysis offers us a way to religion, and that is its greatest gift to man. Neither the Virgin Birth, nor the Death on the Cross, neither the Walking on the Sea nor the Raising of Lazarus, neither the Resurrection nor the Kingdom of

> Heaven, neither good nor evil, neither sinning nor salvation, does the analyst find incredible; on the contrary, all these things to him are self-evident reality. He makes bold to interpret them, but he knows their meaning is equivocal; nay, all-embracing, for God and the world are in the symbol.

In putting together these quotations, two conclusions seem evident. First, psychoanalysis does not, cannot, and must not make pronouncements on human value and the metaphysical questions. However, the insights derived from psychoanalytic work can easily serve as steps to *individual* affirmation. Thus, while a proper development of the psychiatric sciences stops short of the area of religion, it may, for this very reason, accomplish far more in philosophical direction.

"Buddhist World Philosophy"

A quarterly of this title, published in Three Rivers, Mich., and edited by Marie Harlowe, establishes identification with various aspects of the Theosophical Movement. To begin with, the masthead explanation of this publication's purpose contains a statement of objectives strongly reminiscent of Theosophical Objects:

1. To direct its energies towards the evolvement of the Ideal of Universal Brotherhood.
2. To proclaim life and its sanctity in all creatures.
3. To destroy the limitations of the negative Semitic religious god-concept, and to create a new thought-matrix for an advanced humane concept.

While the specific aim of *Buddhist World Philosophy* is "to turn America Buddha-ward," the editor clearly perceives that nothing would be accomplished by the usual sort of organizational proselytizing. In an accompanying statement of objects, we find this statement as to the proper ways and means of spreading Buddha's truth:

> All of this shall be accomplished without the crystallizing effects of organization of any kind. Moral and financial support of those who understand the magnitude and importance of this work—who can put reason before emotion, justice before tradition, and human progress above all—is solicited.

Paralleling the Declaration of ULT

The contributors to *Buddhist World Philosophy* include Indian, Japanese, and American students. Generally speaking, the intent seems to be to transcend sectarianism—including the various Buddhist varieties.

The editorial for the January-March issue is suggestive of the Declaration of the United Lodge of Theosophists, and is probably based upon similar experiences with the partisanships which can so easily develop:

> We decry on the one hand, the orthodox ecclesiasticism of the Southern (Theravada) School, and all that that narrowness implies; on the other hand, we perceive with regret the deterioration of Buddhism in the Northern School (Mahayana), with its addition of gods and a heaven (Pure Land). For our own part, we shall ever seek to attain the original teachings of the Buddha, and to propagate them.
>
> Though we will make every effort to propagate Buddhism in America, we will do so entirely without any organization efforts. We have no wish, or expectation, to do more than plant the seeds of the *Dhamma* in America. And we renounce all gain and all merit of our efforts in so doing.
>
> We shall at all times be cooperative with any sincere effort to propagate Buddhism in America, and will work with any teacher or school....

Buddhist Publication Reviews "Reincarnation—East-West"

Since it is so often maintained that Buddhists are not really concerned with the idea of reincarnation, it is of more than passing interest to note a review of *Reincarnation: An East-West Anthology* in the May *Middle Way,* chief journal of the Buddhist Society in England. Mr. Christmas Humphreys, President of the Buddhist Society, regards the volume with considerable favor. In addition to his praise for the organization of the volume—"a full-scale anthology, well compiled and beautifully produced"—Mr. Humphreys takes up the matter of reincarnation in relation to Buddhism:

> It is strange that a teaching so fundamental as Rebirth is seldom stressed in Buddhist literature. Yet it is basic to Hinduism and the Buddha described it in great detail. It is, indeed, a necessary corollary of the doctrine of Karma, which Hinduism and Buddhism have in common for there is no justice in a world where the causes generated in a long life have no later life in which to produce their effects. There is a modern attempt in Buddhist circles to denigrate from the Buddha's teaching in the Pali Canon, and to reduce this magnificent doctrine to the level of biological metabolism, yet this was not the teaching of the Buddha, who himself remembered his own past lives and described those of his disciples. Such a teaching has immense results on the lives of those who hold it to be true, so fundamental that this may explain occasional reluctance to accept it. Time expands to an infinite past and future; we can plan the next "day" of our life as freely as we plan tomorrow."

THE CONNECTION WITH KARMA

Mr. Humphreys continues:

> Life's injustice is explained and the born cripple and the born prodigy alike make sense in the light of their past behaviour. True, we cannot prove the doctrine of Rebirth, however called, but at least it is an attractive working hypothesis which all experience corroborates, and which solves a number of problems which no other theory solves. The only argument against it is that this present brain does not remember its past lives. Of course not, is one answer, for the brain is new each life, yet strangely enough a great many brains do remember, or the indwelling mind imprints on the new brain memories of past experiences.

ALBIGENSIAN THEOSOPHY—NEW HISTORICAL NOTES

A recently-translated scholarly work, *Massacre at Montségur: A History of the Albigensian Crusade,* is discussed by Bray Boyce in the *Saturday Review* for March 31. This lengthy volume was written by Zoé Oldenbourg, and is concerned with the political machinations which underlay the extermination of the Albigensian inhabitants of Languedoc. The point of Theosophical interest is the recognition on the part of Miss Oldenbourg that the Albigenses were persecuted because there was no vitality in Catholicism to combat their reincarnationist teachings. As Prof. Boyce, of Northwestern University, puts it: "The Church in the Midi was spiritually dead, without the ability or the inspiration to combat the Cathar (Albigensian) teaching." Another writer has suggested that the Catholic "war" against the Albigenses was an important turning-point in the history of Christianity—because the Inquisition then came into being specifically in order to expunge a philosophy that could not be combated in rational terms.

ORIGIN OF THE INQUISITION

In a comment on a papal encyclical of 1938 which referred to the "terrible Albigenses," Lookout (26:144) traced one bit of history:

> The inquisition as an institution with special machinery for searching out heretics came into being during the crusade against the Catharists, and it was organized under the direction of the Dominicans. Throughout the thirteenth century the holy inquisitors tortured and burned the Albigenses. Nobles of northern France were recruited to the murderous campaign by the promise of papal indulgences, and finally all resistance was put down after the rich districts of Languedoc and Provence had been devastated.

The "terrible" Albigenses led lives of virtue and purity. They were extreme ascetics, fasting three days of the week and observing three lents during the year. Initiation into the priesthood involved literal observance of the Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount. They believed in the ultimate salvation of all men. Such was the simple faith of these people of "craft and violence."

Light from Asia

The lineage of the Albigensian teaching is traced in an unusual work entitled *Magicians, Seers, and Mystics,* by Reginald Merton. Also translated from the French by Maurice Magre, *Magicians, Seers, and Mystics* connects the reincarnationism of the Albigenses with Mahayana Buddhism and shows the essential structure of a common theosophical philosophy:

> The Albigenses were Western Buddhists who introduced a blend of gnostic Christianity into the Oriental doctrine. How the words of Buddha could have traversed continents and fallen into the souls of the men of Languedoc is not known. . . . Buddhism travelled across the world, and among the people of Languedoc, who were then more mystical than sensual, it was transformed into Catharism.
>
> For the Albigenses the origin of God was unknowable. For the Hindus, similarly, Brahma, the cause of causes, is enveloped in a six-fold veil and is inaccessible to human conception. At a given moment of time, men's souls, in virtue of a law of desire which Christians call original sin, become detached from the divine matrix, from the infinite spirit, and are incarnated in matter for pleasure and suffering. They begin a journey, in the course of which, after reaching the lowest point of materialization, they will climb again stage by stage through the organised hierarchies of creation towards the first source, the divine spirit, from which they were detached.
>
> This last part of their journey, the return to the divine, proceeds by means of successive reincarnations in unperfect human bodies. In each life it is our actions, our capacity for detachment, that cause us to rise more quickly or less quickly. The more desires we have, the more we give rein to our passions, the more we love the material—by so much do we retard our entrance into the Kingdom of Spirit.

Stages of Initiation

> Within the sect there were several grades. Ordinary adherents, who recognized the truth of the principles, enunciated and defended them as best they could, but continued to lead a worldly life, were called believers (*credentes*). They corresponded to those who followed "the middle path," recommended by Buddha for ordinary men. . . . Above the believers were the adepts (*perfecti*), who had sacrificed the life of

the body for the life of the spirit. The Albigensian adepts were heirs to a lost secret which came from the East and was known to the Gnostics and the early Christians. The basis of this secret was the transmission of the power of love. The gesture of the rite was the material, visible means of projecting this power. Behind it was hidden the spiritual gift by which the soul was helped, was able to cross without suffering the narrow portal of death, to escape the shadows and become merged with the light.

The principle cause of the great massacre of the Albigenses, the hidden cause but the true one, was that the ancient teaching of the mysteries, so jealously guarded by all priesthoods in every temple in the world, had been revealed.

One portion of the Catharist heresy—shared, quite likely by the Albigenses—is described by Miss Oldenbourg:

The Cathars, generally speaking, acknowledged the doctrine of metempsychosis as held by the Hindus, with the same precise calculations governing posthumous retribution for the individual. A man who had led a just life would be reincarnated in a body better suited for his further spiritual development; whereas the criminal was liable, after his death, to be reborn in a body full of flaws and hereditary vices. . . .

More on the Bushman

Prompted by a Lookout item (February) regarding the Bushman of the Kalahari desert of Africa, a reader has called attention to *The Heart of the Hunter,* most recent book by Laurens van der Post, as a source of more detailed information. In commenting on this and an earlier work by the same author, *Lost World of the Kalahari,* our correspondent notes that "Post is acquainted with Eastern Philosophy (quoting from the Puranas) and in his own right uses intuition to the full in explaining the Bushman's anthropology, theogony, etc."

Both books are of interest, since much information is given about the religion of the Bushman and the psychic occurrences in his life. The stories of the Bushman are interpreted in such a way that his philosophy is apparent, that "matter and spirit are mysterious manifestations of one and the same whole."

Unseen not Unknown

As might be expected, these people feel a kinship with Nature, a sense of the unseen which is as vivid and distinct as their awareness of the more obvious physical world. To the student of Theosophy their

interpretation of certain events is in accord with the doctrine of elementals. For instance, the antagonism of the "gods" who effectively and repeatedly damaged photographic equipment at Slippery Hills, the "home of very old and very great spirits"—a phenomenon otherwise inexplicable.

The "magic" which protected the lovely steenbuck was explained by an old father of the Bushman people as:

> That of the innocent, the gentle and the beautiful combined in one. It was a creature—too beautiful to be aware of imperfection, too innocent to know fear, too gentle to suspect violence . . . The person who stood watching would suddenly find there was "a steenbuck person" behind him who "feeling he was looking nicely at the little buck, wanted him to act nicely and prettily too." When the person who had come to kill the steenbuck fitted the arrow to his bow and aimed to shoot, the steenbuck person behind him "pulled at his arm and made him miss." Yes, that was the magic of the steenbuck; it had a steenbuck person to protect it.

Van der Post experienced the effect of this magic when he was unable to hit one of these animals at short distance.

An Earlier Time

The primeval quality of this African native was sensed by the author at an early age.

> Even as a child it seemed to me that his world was one without secrets between one form of being and another. As I tried to form a picture of what he was really like, it came to me that he was back in the moment which our European fairy-tale books described as the time when birds, beasts, plants, trees and men shared a common tongue, and the whole world, night and day, resounded like the surf of a coral sea with universal conversation.

Man Against Man

Was there a reason for the policy of virtual extermination of these simple folk, for the abuse heaped upon them by both the black and white people? Sensing the troubled heritage of his African birth, this author suggests:

> First, one must vilify in one's own spirit what one is about to destroy in others; and the greater the unadmitted doubt of the deed within, the greater the fanaticism of the action without. Ominously, from the start there was nothing too bad to be said about the Bushman. He was, for instance, not even a savage—he was no better than a wild animal

and he used such intelligence as he possessed merely to make himself a more dangerous and efficient animal. He was dirty beyond the bounds of savagery. This particular charge was pressed home with great zeal and heat, and I have encountered it now so often, not only in regard to the Bushman, but also in regard to other primitive peoples of Africa, that I could write an essay on its dubious role in our spirit. However, it is enough to say here that over and over again I found this reproach of physical dirt used as a smoke screen to hide the naked humanity of the little hunter from the hearts of those about to crush him with their own inhumanity.

OUR "WAR" WITH NATURE

The *Herald Examiner* (Los Angeles) for June 13 quotes from marine biologist Rachel Carson's address to graduates of Scripps College. Dr. Carson, author of *The Sea Around Us,* said:

> Our power over nature has not been tempered with wisdom, but has been marked by irresponsibility. Man's war against nature is inevitably a war against himself. There is too little awareness that man is part of nature.
>
> The once beneficent rains are now an instrument to bring down from the atmosphere the deadly products of nuclear explosions. Our streams are fouled with an incredible assortment of wastes—domestic, chemical, radioactive, so that our planet is rapidly becoming a thirsty world.
>
> It is not too much to say that the continued existence of mankind and the very survival of the earth as a habitat for life may depend on an awakening to our true place in nature.
>
> Today's graduates go out into a world where mankind is challenged as it has never been challenged before to prove its maturity and mastery not of nature, but of itself.

ULT LIBRARY
BANGALORE.
Accn. No - 89 --

Bound by
S[illegible]MA BROS.
[illegible]d Cross, 8th Block
[illegible]vanagar, Bangalore-560 041.